

CAI
ND71
-1995
N26



Strathrobyn Papers



THE NEW PEACEKEEPING PARTNERSHIP

BY

ALEX MORRISON

AND

SUZANNE M. PLAIN

AUGUST 1994



CANADIAN FORCES COLLEGE / COLLÈGE DES FORCES CANADIENNES

94083001

Canada



Strathrobyn Papers

Message from the Commandant

This issue of the *Strathrobyn Papers* is published as the Canadian Forces Command and Staff College enters its second half-century of service to Canada and to the Canadian Armed Forces. It is hoped that the *Strathrobyn Papers* will continue to contribute to ensuring that the Canadian public has an understanding of the nation-building role of the Canadian Forces.

The participation of the Canadian Armed Forces in United Nations peacekeeping operations has been a feature of Canada's foreign and defence policy for almost five decades. In recent months, the UN's capability to cope effectively with the proliferating sources of regional conflict and global instability has been increasingly scrutinized and criticized; indeed, the continued participation in UN peacekeeping operations by Canada was debated in the House of Commons earlier this year.

Awareness by the Canadian public of key issues such as the nature and scope of Canada's contribution to the maintenance of peace and order in a world undergoing profound changes is critical to the development of the Government's eventual direction to the Department of National Defence. Thus, I remain optimistic that the *Strathrobyn Papers* will provide a venue for ideas and perspectives which might assist in the productive debate leading to the formulation and maturation of Canada's post Cold War defence policy.

Message du Commandant

Ce numéro du *Strathrobyn Papers* est publié au moment où le Collège de commandement et d'état-major des Forces canadiennes entreprend une deuxième cinquantaine au service du Canada et des Forces canadiennes. J'espère que le *Strathrobyn Papers* continuera à apporter sa contribution afin d'assurer que le public canadien comprend le rôle que jouent les membres des Forces canadiennes en tant que bâtisseurs de la nation.

La participation des Forces canadiennes aux opérations de maintien de la paix de l'ONU a été, depuis presque cinq décennies, une caractéristique de la politique étrangère et de défense du Canada. Au cours des derniers mois, la capacité de l'ONU à affronter efficacement les sources accrues de conflits régionaux et l'instabilité mondiale est de plus en plus étudiée et critiquée; en effet, la participation continue du Canada aux opérations de maintien de la paix de l'ONU a été discutée à la Chambre des Communes au début de cette année.

La sensibilisation du public canadien, en ce qui a trait aux questions clés comme la nature et la portée de la contribution du Canada au maintien de la paix et de l'ordre dans un monde qui subit des transformations profondes, est critique au développement que prendra le gouvernement concernant le ministère de la Défense nationale. Ainsi, je demeure optimiste du fait que le *Strathrobyn Papers* sera une occasion d'échanger des idées et points de vue. Ces derniers pourraient servir de ressources potentielles lors d'une discussion productive menant à la formulation et au développement de la politique de défense du Canada de l'après-guerre froide.

Le Commandant
Commodore K.A. Nason

Commodore K.A. Nason
Commandant

THE NEW PEACEKEEPING PARTNERSHIP

BY

ALEX MORRISON

and

SUZANNE M. PLAIN

ABSTRACT

Due to the imperatives of dramatic change in the international environment, there is developing a New Peacekeeping Partnership (NPP) among the military, humanitarian aid agencies, good governance officials and civilian police. The NPP is moving beyond the traditional peacekeeping role of military interposition to include an array of third-party activities designed to make international stability operations more effective. Both as a reflection of the increasing complexity of peacekeeping operations and indicative of the pressure governments are facing to decrease defence budgets and lower deficits, the New Peacekeeping Partnership is, and must be by definition, more inclusive. Thus in an effort to encourage greater participation among non-traditional states possessed of the willingness to learn, traditional peacekeepers such as Canada are shifting their attention towards education, research and training. In this regard, the establishment of The Canadian Peacekeeping Centre represents a step in the right direction.



THE AUTHORS

Alex Morrison, MSC, CD, MA, is Executive Director of the Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies and of The Canadian Peacekeeping Centre. Mr. Morrison was Minister-Counsellor at the Canadian Mission to the United Nations where he served from 1983-1989 with special responsibility for matters concerning international security, arms control and disarmament, and peacekeeping.

Suzanne M. Plain, MA, is a 1993 graduate and Fellow of the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs in Ottawa where she specialized in conflict analysis and third-party activities. She is currently a Research Officer at the Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies under the sponsorship of the Military and Strategic Studies Programme (MSSP) of the Department of National Defence.

RÉSUMÉ

En raison des changements dramatiques qui s'imposent au niveau international, une Nouvelle association pour le maintien de la paix (NAMP) est en voie de naître et ce, entre l'Armée, les agences d'aide humanitaire, les responsables compétents en matière d'autorité et la force policière civile. La MAMP va au-delà de son rôle traditionnel de maintien de la paix en rapport à l'intervention militaire, pour englober un éventail de tierces activités destinées à effectuer des opérations de stabilité internationales plus efficaces. Pour refléter la complexité croissante des opérations de maintien de la paix, et l'indicatif de la pression que les gouvernements subissent pour diminuer les budgets de défense et baisser la dette nationale, la Nouvelle association pour le maintien de la paix est, et doit être plus globale par définition. Ainsi, dans un effort pour encourager une plus grande participation des états non traditionnels qui avaient la volonté d'apprendre, les gardiens de la paix traditionnels comme le Canada déplacent leur centre d'intérêt vers les domaines tels l'instruction, la recherche et la formation. A cet égard, la fondation du Centre canadien pour le maintien de la paix représente une étape dans la bonne direction.

LES AUTEURS

Alex Morrison, M.Sc., C.D. M.A. est directeur de l'Institut canadien des études stratégiques et du Centre canadien pour le maintien de la paix. M.Morrison était Ministre-conseiller au Centre canadien des Nations Unies où il a été en fonction de 1983 à 1989, et il avait l'importante responsabilité des affaires se rapportant à la sécurité internationale, au contrôle des armements et au désarmement, au au maintien de la paix.

Suzanne Plain, M.A. a diplômé en 1993 et elle est membre de l'École des affaires internationales Norman Paterson où elle s'est spécialisée dans l'analyse de conflits et de tierces activités. Elle est actuellement officier de recherche à l'Institut canadien des études stratégiques et parrainée par l'Armée et le Programme des études stratégique du ministère de la Défense nationale.

The New Peacekeeping Partnership¹

by Alex Morrison and Suzanne M. Plain

When the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact collapsed in the face of Western determination that democracy would prevail, many hoped that the easing of East-West tensions would result in the decline of war. But the end of the Cold War has not brought about the era of universal peace, harmony and tranquillity that many expected. Instead it has ushered in a period of great uncertainty. In Eastern Europe and areas of the former Soviet Union, and in other locations throughout the world, religious, ethnic and nationalist tensions have burst violently through the surface and are threatening to spread far and wide. In addition, disputes over declining resources, the state of the world's environment, political, tribal, cultural, energy and economic concerns are causing massive refugee flows with the resultant social unrest. Further, the power of the media, especially that of television, has increased to keep pace with "the 500 channel television network" and the information superhighway. National and international decisions are being heavily influenced and may even be decided by a measuring of the media attention directed to one or a series of events -- and by governments' reactions to the perceived, or hoped for, resultant shifts in public opinion. Many are the policies formulated on the basis of tomorrow's polls.

The nature of intra- and inter-state conflict has changed dramatically. Humanitarianism has made its fledgling appearance as the driving rationale behind the launching of new international military missions. More and more, UN military peacekeepers are dealing with hostile elements which blend easily into the civilian population. Deprivation of the basic necessities of life has become a weapon. Moreover, contact between peacekeeping troops and non-governmental organizations has increased tremendously as peacekeepers are being asked to undertake a range of third-party activities outside the traditional scope of military interposition. Military peacekeepers now operate as equal partners alongside a growing body of humanitarian aid workers, law enforcement officers, good governance officials, and non-governmental organizations with various and often conflicting mandates.

There is a new and heightened interest in the subject of security writ large. The realization that democracy, sustainable development and security are intertwined is spawning new searches for innovative and enhanced methods of conflict resolution. With ever-increasing hopes and expectations, peoples thus are looking to the United Nations and to other international organizations to supply solutions to these challenges and, as well, to meet new opportunities which are occurring at a rate unimaginable a few years ago.

In the area of international peacekeeping, the UN has responded by creating in the last five years more peacekeeping missions than in the first four decades of its existence. Military men and women from well over 100 countries have worn the Blue Beret and the Blue Helmet or have served in civilian capacities in the cause of international peace, security and stability. Currently there are over 80,000 peacekeepers on duty in 13 missions. Peacekeepers have monitored and enforced ceasefires, verified security agreements, ensured the delivery of humanitarian aid and the provision of basic governmental structures and services, and have assisted in the evolution from colony to nation. The number and range of activities now taking place under "the peacekeeping umbrella" was virtually unimaginable a few years ago. Peacekeeping missions now run

the gamut from those deploying unarmed observers in a monitoring and reporting role, through the classic interpositional model such as that of UNFICYP in Cyprus, the supervision of elections in Namibia, the lifting of minefields in Kuwait and elsewhere, to, some would say, the events of the Gulf War.

However, accompanying the expansion of the peacekeeping umbrella is the realization that the UN cannot continue to be all things to all peoples. In its newest and most dangerous operations, the UN is being challenged to push out the frontiers of, and in many cases to move beyond, the consent of the parties involved in a conflict and to resort to military capabilities that were unthinkable for peacekeepers in the past -- what John Mackinlay and Jarat Chopra have aptly labelled as "second generation peacekeeping".² Many are the testimonies offered by humanitarian aid workers to the efficiency of the military. Although it is lamentable indeed that such a small percentage of food, medical aid and other necessities of life eventually reach those in true need, it is to the military protection of relief convoys that thanks is due for whatever amount is received by those who would suffer grievously or die from want of supplies. Given the proliferation of conflicts around the world, controversy over operations in Somalia and the former Yugoslavia, cuts in defence spending and efforts to reduce national deficits, politicians are hard pressed in their attempts to do more with less. It is clear that in the future, even more than now, the UN must pick and choose carefully its peacekeeping involvements. This raises the philosophical issue of "conflict" and to what extent conflict may or may not be resolved in some situations. It emphasizes the need for a redirection of peacekeeping efforts towards the education, research and training that may include traditional and non-traditional contributors possessed of the willingness to learn, so that the maximum benefit may be gained from any expenditure of resources.

To this end, the Canadian Parliament recently sat to consider the effectiveness of peacekeeping and future directions for Canada's role as peacekeeper in the world's trouble spots. The general flavour of the debate indicated that Members of Parliament wish Canada to continue to play a substantial part in the years ahead as it has in the past.

Yet it may be that two of the harsh realities of the end of the Cold War and the rise in conflict are these: (1) There are some conflicts which are, quite simply, incapable of resolution. That is, we must accept that UN peacekeeping forces will be deployed in certain troublesome areas of the world for decades or even centuries. One UN peacekeeping mission that has been in place for almost 50 years is UNTSO; UNFICYP in Cyprus is in its fourth decade of operation and the mission in Lebanon will soon be a quarter of a century old. Those who lament that it is necessary to have troops deployed for so long and who call for withdrawal of the military must think of the thousands of people who are alive simply because of the presence of the UN peacekeeping force. In the face of such considerations, a stay of fifty years or so suddenly becomes more acceptable. It is simply the price troop-contributing countries must pay to prevent bloodshed, suffering, death and full-scale regional or global wars. (2) It is not possible to solve all conflicts at once. A "pick and choose" option plan will have to be devised which will, according to various criteria, determine which problems are to receive Canadian and international attention. Governments will need to exercise great resolve in remaining firm in the face of public demands to intervene in whichever dispute is being accorded the greatest media attention at the moment.

Since the publication of UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali's An

Agenda for Peace,³ which he presented in June of 1993 in response to the request made to him in January at the first-ever meeting of the Security Council at the level of heads of State and Government, there have been long and full debates over the definition of peacekeeping. Indeed, the number of terms has proliferated greatly: peacemaking, peace restoration, peace establishment, preventive diplomacy and peace stabilization are but a few that have been discussed. Bearing in mind the current and envisaged international situation and the composition of peacekeeping efforts, and in the interest of bringing coherence and stability to the debate, the following definition of peacekeeping is offered for consideration:

Actions designed to enhance international peace, security and stability which are authorized by competent national and international organizations and which are undertaken cooperatively by military, humanitarian, good governance, civilian police, and other interested agencies and groups.⁴

When considering the definitional aspects of peacekeeping, it is important to bear in mind that whatever the outcome is, it ought not to detract from the long-established, positive aura of peacekeeping.

THE CANADIAN PERFORMANCE

Canada has always played a prominent role in peacekeeping. Its government and its citizens have consistently reaffirmed their determination to continue to make a significant contribution. Ever since Mr. Lester B. Pearson, the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs during the Suez Crisis of 1956, suggested the establishment of the UN Emergency Force (UNEF I) as a solution to that conflict, and for which he received the 1957 Nobel Peace Prize, the name of Canada and peacekeeping have been synonymous. In addition to providing much-needed experience and expertise in all areas and at all levels of UN and other international stability operations, peacekeeping has been a high-profile way for Canada to participate in world affairs over the years, and to enjoy international prestige disproportionate to what its resources otherwise would have allowed. Through peacekeeping, Canada has been able not only to prevent conflict and save lives but also, by example, to contribute to the process of democratization.

Almost 100,000 men and women of the Canadian Armed Forces and thousands of Canadian civilians have taken part in peacekeeping missions - more than from any other country. Canada has contributed personnel, materiel and resources to every UN peacekeeping endeavour. No other country can match that record. Canadians have also been members of a number of non-UN peacekeeping missions. Almost 100 Canadians have lost their lives in the service of peace while wearing the Blue Helmet or the Blue Beret.

Canadian officers have commanded peacekeeping missions in the Middle East (UNTSO), Egypt (UNEF I), the Golan Heights (UNDOF), India/Pakistan (UNMOGIP, UNIPOM), Cyprus (UNFICYP), Central America (ONUCA), and Uganda/Rwanda (UNOMUR). The current military advisor to the UN Secretary-General is a Canadian, Major-General Maurice Baril. In addition, Canadians have held many responsible, high-level positions in virtually all of the UN operations. On the political front, the Right

Honourable Joe Clark has recently been appointed as the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Cyprus.

Today, Canadian men and women are serving in peacekeeping missions in Korea, the Middle East, the Golan Heights, the Sinai Desert, Afghanistan and Pakistan, Iraq and Kuwait, the Western Sahara, Angola, El Salvador, Croatia, Bosnia and other parts of the former Yugoslavia, Cambodia, Somalia, Mozambique, and Cyprus. Time and again it has been demonstrated that Canadians possess a mastery of the skills necessary to coordinate and manage large forces and projects. This talent has led to an overwhelming number of requests from other countries for instructional material and guidance on how to become good peacekeepers.

THE NEW PEACEKEEPING PARTNERSHIP

There is now developing in Canada a New Peacekeeping Partnership composed of the military, humanitarian aid agencies, good governance officials, non-governmental organizations and civilian police. Each of the members of the new partnership is aware of the benefits to be gained from learning the characteristics and capabilities of the others. In the future, it may be that, for example, an official from the Red Cross could be stationed at National Defence Headquarters to advise on how humanitarian aid agencies can assist in the planning for peacekeeping operations. Humanitarian aid officials are present in virtually every country of the world and thus will have advance knowledge of crises. It would seem that through such an interchange of information between peacekeeping partners, operations could be more effective and more resource-efficient.

Each of the partners is considering how the partnership can be enlarged. For example: Is there a place for police personnel other than members of the RCMP? There are those who hold that the legal ramifications of such action need greater consideration. Further, it may be that, due to personnel shortages, municipalities and provinces will not agree to allowing their law enforcement officers to be employed abroad on peacekeeping missions. Citizens would not take kindly to a decrease in police protection locally in order to contribute to peacekeeping operations. How are the roles and contributions of the navy, army and air forces evolving? How can the utilization of the expertise and contacts of humanitarian aid agencies be enhanced? How can traditional peacekeeping mechanisms and modalities be put to use in non-traditional environments? The members of this partnership are determined to cooperate to ensure that international stability operations are conducted as professionally as possible.

Canada is exceptionally well placed to lead the further development of the concept and practice of "The New Peacekeeping Partnership" and its implementation by other countries.

CONFLICT "RE-SOLUTION"

Part of ensuring that international stability operations are as effective as possible means considering to what extent conflict resolution is really possible. It may be that in some situations conflict will never disappear completely and that the best that can be hoped for is a "re-resolution" at a lower, less violent level. In the summer 1993 issue of

Foreign Affairs, Samuel P. Huntington suggests that we are entering a new phase of world politics, one in which the fundamental source of conflict will not be ideological or economic, but cultural. This inevitable "clash of civilizations", he warns, will be most acute in "torn countries" where different cultural groups exist, brought closer through the forces of economic regionalism. Moreover, he says, the "clash" will be particularly virulent and deep-seated as it accentuates fundamental value differences between those who embrace the liberal democratic philosophy of the West and those who define themselves by opposition to it.⁵

Huntington's analysis, though it does not bode well for peacekeepers, certainly should not surprise them, for this would appear to be the direction in which the new world "dis-order" is heading as long-suppressed and deep-seated cultural disagreements have resurfaced with the relaxation of bipolar tension and the realignment of the world into economic blocs. Some areas of the world seem particularly prone to violence and their conflicts need almost constant attention as they are "re-solved" again. Somalia provides a particularly ghoulish example. Whereas the Middle East had previously provided analysts with the spectre of "Lebanonization" as perhaps one of the worst epithets in politics, describing the seemingly infinite fragmentation of a country along religious and ethnic lines, Somalia has gone further and now exhibits the logical extreme of fragmentation; members of a single ethnic group who share the same religion, history and language but are now split among heavily-armed clans.⁶ Perhaps due to a too-hasty forging of alliances in Somalia, the UN and the USA have found themselves in the unenviable position of supporting a clan chieftain, only to reverse their position later, labelling him a "warlord" and trying to effect his arrest. After it became apparent that he could not be found, he was once again recognized as a true leader deserving of respect.

Likewise, in the former Yugoslavia, the UN is involved in a military operation for the first time on European soil, where the concept of UN intervention seemed almost surrealistic until the collapse of the Soviet Union, but which now seems the possible source of demand for future UN services. The dissolution of a UN member state into six and perhaps more new countries has entailed violence and displacement of a magnitude not seen in Europe since the Second World War.⁷ Also, there are disturbing signs that this sort of internecine, cultural conflict will emerge elsewhere, as with the competition between political factions for power in Cambodia and with the standoff between natives and government troops in the Mexican state of Chiapas.

Seemingly chronic external violence should not, as some have argued, justify turning inward. The primary question still should be one of humanitarian responsibility: In a particular situation, will some people not live longer or better because of the intervention of peacekeepers? Can it not be said that peacekeeping benefits people? If this be the case, then states such as Canada must continue to fulfil their responsibility as active, international participants of the global community. The fact remains that "a good world citizen commits its troops" for whatever length of time may be necessary to dilute conflict and to keep it at a minimally acceptable level. Arguably, therein lies the true measure of sovereignty. Simon Serfaty, Senior Associate with the Washington-based Centre for Strategic and International Studies, asserts that Canadian and other troops in Bosnia have reduced suffering, limited civilian casualties and kept the conflict from spilling over into neighbouring territory:

"We should not underestimate the contribution made by the ground forces. They are

achieving tangible results and the sole fear of taking a few casualties should not be enough to make them run. The decision to stay or pull out will have to be made by the Canadians and others on the basis of the capabilities they have, the humanitarian commitment they're willing to make and the price they're willing to pay for it...But if Canada's commitment to peacekeeping was based solely on the idea that it would never cost any lives and it could always be done on the cheap, then that's nothing to boast about."⁸

Yet recognizing that there is a gap between expectations and performance, it is clear that contributor states need to be more discriminating about the conflicts and manner in which they intervene. Indeed, as has been previously noted, decreasing defence budgets and reduced numbers of personnel will force governments to "pick and choose".

PEACEKEEPING'S ESSENTIAL CATEGORIES

When a country considers its potential contribution to a peacekeeping mission, it decides the percentage of each of the following categories it will select:

- (a) personnel
- (b) financing
- (c) materiel and equipment, and
- (d) research, education and training.

Each of these must be considered against the backdrop of command, control and communications. That is, there must be a central authority with the ability to define and oversee the entire operation.

Canada has contributed to peacekeeping in all of the four categories. Indications are that, as the government reduces the size of the armed forces while continuing to insist that Canada remain a high-profile, significant power player on the international security stage, it will be necessary for our contribution to be less in the areas of personnel and financing and more in the other two areas. Thus, in the future, our overall contribution can be as significant as it has been in the past, but will involve the other areas to a greater degree. That is, an increase in research, education and training (subjects on which there is now much greater focus in Canada and elsewhere), can compensate for a decrease in personnel contributed and in the length of time Canada participates in any given mission.

The potential shift in the way Canada contributes to the four categories comes at a time when many more countries are anxious and willing to participate in peacekeeping operations and thus would welcome Canadian aid in helping them to become proficient.

THE BROADER REQUIREMENT

Generally, the military and civilian on-the-ground peacekeeping forces of the UN have been eminently successful. Where they have been unable to carry out their mandates, the Security Council has insisted that they remain in place and function as best they can. The UN and member states are extremely reluctant to wind down a mission

where there is a possibility that it could continue to serve a useful purpose. It is much easier to respond effectively to outbursts of violence if there is already a peacekeeping force in existence and deployed. One mission, that of UNTSO, is used as a reserve to reinforce UNIFIL and to be a reserve force which the UN can quickly draw personal to deploy to a new theatre of operations.

Where peacekeeping missions have been regarded as failures it has been chiefly because the underlying causes of conflict have not been addressed. Once the Security Council has established a force and deployed the troops, there is a tendency for politicians to enter "the era of the long sigh" or "the era of the long pause". The feeling is one of relief that the military are on the spot and thus it is not necessary to effect political solutions, i.e. to address the underlying causes. In addition to ensuring constant political action concurrent with the establishment and operation of peacekeeping missions, there must be concerted efforts to solve political disputes before they erupt into open conflict. It is in this latter area where humanitarian aid officials can be of tremendous assistance. With their presence in virtually every country of the world, they can provide valuable information about impending crises.

It has been normal UN practice that contingents and HQ personnel are requested on the basis of "equitable geographic representation". That is, there must be, in each force, an equal or almost equal representation from the various areas of the world. This practise is often implemented without due regard for experience, expertise or competence. In addition, the UN does not outline anything more than the basic requirement skills for each headquarters position and does absolutely no checking at all that those requirements are in fact possessed by the person assuming the appointment. The first time most of the headquarters personnel meet one another is when the headquarters is set up in the new mission area. As His Excellency Mr. Francesco Paolo Fulei, the Italian Ambassador to the UN, says, "[t]he UN is currently suffering from too much credibility rather than the lack of credibility with which it was afflicted in the past", implying that perhaps the international community assumes too much in the name of the United Nations without really considering what its members are doing. Evidently, it has now reached the point where a standardization of talents and skills is required by contingents and individuals assigned to peacekeeping duties. "Force, he says, [must be] combined with an active diplomatic programme aimed at bringing reason to the unreasonable."

The recent UN practice of ensuring religious balance in peacekeeping missions, often to the detriment of proficiency and professionalism, must also be addressed.

It is simply an acknowledgement of the present-day realities to accept that there are two categories of peacekeepers: (1) those from countries which have been traditional contributors and which have been able to put to good use in a peacekeeping environment the skills gained in other multi-national military organizations, and (2) those from countries less-experienced but possessed of a willingness to learn. That willingness to learn ought to be accommodated and encouraged.

Each of the non-military peacekeeping partners should be official members of each peacekeeping mission. There should perhaps be certain specified positions for them. Thus the commander of the force will have the experience and advice at hand when it is needed. If such is to be the case, then there is a need for education and training in working with individuals from other countries in a multi-national setting.

Also, there is more need now for cultural awareness training than has been the

case in the past. In missions such as election supervision and the delivery of humanitarian aid which entails very close contact with local populations, it is essential that all peacekeeping personnel be cognizant of the national and regional characteristics, habits and customs of the country concerned. It is also necessary that rules of engagement be clear, known to each member of the force and scrupulously observed by all.

The effective conduct of peacekeeping efforts places great reliance on commanders and leaders at all levels. Peacekeepers are both ambassadors and teachers-by-example. They must be consummate diplomats and know instinctively what negotiating skills to employ in any given situation. They must know the limits of their authority and responsibility as well as the limits of their capabilities. In other words, they must be highly-skilled in conflict resolution techniques. They must have tremendous self-control, know when to exercise initiative and how to determine quickly the merits of any situation and then act decisively. In other words, they need all the attributes possessed by professional soldiers.

In An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping, UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali's report of 17 June 1992 to the UN Security Council, he writes

The sources of conflict and war are pervasive and deep. To reach them will require our utmost effort to enhance respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, to promote sustainable economic and social development for wider prosperity, to alleviate distress and curtail the existence and use of massively destructive weapons.

Later, he advocates that the UN have the following aims:

- * To seek to identify at the earliest possible stage situations that could produce conflict, and to try through diplomacy to remove the sources of danger before violence results;
- * Where conflict erupts, to engage in peacekeeping aimed at resolving the issues that have led to conflict;
- * Through peacekeeping to work to preserve peace, however, fragile, where fighting has been halted and to assist implementing agreements achieved by the peacekeepers;
- * To stand ready to assist in peacebuilding in its differing contexts: rebuilding the institutions and infrastructures of nations torn by civil war and strife; and building bonds of peaceful mutual benefit among nations formerly at war;
- * And in the largest sense, to address the deepest causes of conflict: economic despair, social injustice and political oppression. It is possible to discern an increasingly common moral perception that spans the world's nations and peoples, and which is finding expression in

international laws, many owing their genesis to the work of this organization.

Near the conclusion of An Agenda for Peace, the Secretary-General continues his thoughts on the broader context of peacekeeping.

Democracy within nations requires respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, as set forth in the Charter. It requires as well a deeper understanding and respect for the needs of more vulnerable groups of society, especially women and children. This is not only a political matter. The social stability needed for productive growth is nurtured by conditions in which people can readily express their will. For this, strong domestic institutions of participation are essential. Promoting such institutions means promoting the empowerment of the unorganized, the poor, the marginalized. To this end, the focus of the United Nations should be on the "field", the locations where economic, social and political decisions take effect...

Just as it is vital that each of the organs of the United Nations employ its capabilities in the balanced and harmonious fashion envisioned in the Charter, peace in the largest sense cannot be accomplished by the United Nations system or by governments alone. Non-governmental organizations, academic institutions, parliamentarians, business and professional communities, the media and the public at large must all be involved. The New Peacekeeping Partnership must and will continue to grow.

REALIZING ASPIRATIONS

In analyzing An Agenda for Peace in the Winter 1993 issue of The Washington Quarterly,⁹ Thomas G. Weiss, Executive Director of the Academic Council on the United Nations System, considers a number of recommendations that he believes, if implemented, will allow the international community to most effectively grasp the opportunity presented to it in the basic strategy outlined above.

The first of these, Mr. Weiss says, is negative: to downplay or even set aside the unrealistic expectations about the possible future contributions of regional organizations to international peace and security. These organizations can play a helpful role in diplomatic arm-twisting as shown by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) in Cambodia and by the Contadora Group in Central America. But with the exception of NATO, which possesses the most authoritative joint force in the world and advanced cooperative procedures, they are and will remain poor sources for supplying international military forces to help quell interstate and local conflict.

Mr. Weiss' second recommendation is that top priority be given to placing UN military operations on a solid financial base, creating, for starters, a \$50 million revolving fund to help the UN move into action more swiftly in the event of a crisis. Most importantly, though, Mr. Weiss believes that switching the budgeting of UN military operations to defence ministries and away from foreign affairs would, in itself,

go a long way toward the implementation of better fact-finding, preventive diplomacy and peacekeeping.

A third recommendation he makes is that the role of the World Court be emphasized, for the rise in internecine, cultural conflict has generated new questions of how to define sovereignty, command and control, human rights and humanitarian intervention. Granted UN resolutions are often vague in order to secure intergovernmental assent, but Mr. Weiss warns that objective standards that dictate action will increasingly be necessary. In his opinion, these deserve substantial attention and political backing and should stir debate not just among legal experts but also within interested governments.

Another recommendation of Mr. Weiss is to focus on the need for military humanitarian support forces, for he charges that in spite of the UN's fledgling efforts in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Somalia as well as the Allied coalition's efforts in 1991 in Kurdistan, it "is remarkably reticent about ensuring that truly opprobrious behaviour against civilians by governments or insurgents will no longer be tolerated".

And last, Mr. Weiss argues that the UN must give "pride of place" to the new thinking about peace-enforcement units, for this is the cross-over point after traditional peacekeeping. It is therefore incumbent upon national governments to consider through greater research, education and training the issues mentioned above if the international community is to respond decisively, quickly and appropriately to an array of circumstances along the crisis continuum.

THE CANADIAN PHILOSOPHY OF TRAINING AND PREPARATION

The two common approaches to peacekeeping are (1) professional, and (2) "off-the-street". The first is the one espoused by Canada and a number of other countries. It holds that the best training for peacekeepers is training for general purpose combat. Quite simply, professional, career soldiers are the best peacekeepers.

The second approach is that of recruiting specifically for a peacekeeping mission, giving a limited amount of training and then dispatching the person to a theatre of operations to perform specific tasks. The weakness of this approach is that when one of these soldiers is faced with the unexpected, there is no reservoir of experience and expertise from which to draw.

Notwithstanding that the best preparation for peacekeeping is general purpose combat training, there is a recognized need to provide a certain amount of both generic and scenario-specific education and training. There are many characteristics, standard operating procedures and interoperability mechanisms common to all peacekeeping operations which ought to be imparted to those who wish to be participants. It would also be of benefit to units and individuals if they could receive education and training appropriate to the particular mission on which they are about to embark. It is quickly becoming recognized that scenario-specific education and training is a great benefit to units and individuals about to embark on a particular mission.

THE NEED FOR GREATER INVOLVEMENT

It is no longer possible for a few countries to be peacekeepers to the world. As the nature of the international environment has changed, so too have the scope and size of peacekeeping operations. Peacekeeping has become a complex and dangerous undertaking. (The recent debate in the House of Commons over whether Canada should oppose or support NATO air strikes against Bosnia was not because there was a lack of consensus on the need to end the civil war. Rather, it was over the issue of protecting Canadian troops serving with UNPROFOR - some 2000 people.) Participants are engaged in a range of activities that includes the disarming of warring factions, the delivery of humanitarian aid, and some measure of assistance with political reconciliation and reconstruction. In essence, peacekeepers are asked to ensure that as nations are dismembered, stable, new nations are built to replace them. As current operations in Somalia and the former Yugoslavia demonstrate, this can be a very messy job. It is thus in the interests of the countries with the most knowledge of peacekeeping to encourage the widest possible participation by many countries. In the post-Cold War world there is simply too much conflict for a few member states to manage without broad assistance.

There is, therefore, a need for a programme that assists in the education and training of participants, at different levels and in different activities, in peacekeeping and development activities. It is important that peacekeepers be well prepared for the complex circumstances in which they may find themselves, cognizant of cultural sensitivities and well-versed in mediation and diplomatic techniques. Also, they must recognize that "conflict" in some form may be a natural part of all relationships and that their aim is not necessarily the resolution of "conflict", but instead a cessation of violence and the initiation of a process that may help to address the underlying sources of hostility. Moreover, it may be unrealistic to expect peacekeepers to be wholly objective, consistent and impartial. They must balance national interest with the overriding purpose of contributing to international peace, security and stability while assigning and taking corrective action when appropriate.

OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

As has been stated, as a leading peacekeeper, Canada wishes to ensure the continuation of the greatest possible contribution to future international peacekeeping. To do that it will be necessary to evaluate current strategy. The contradictory paths of decreasing size of the Canadian Armed Forces and a governmental desire to continue to be a significant player on the world stage will soon collide. The Canadian military does not have the capacity to continue to meet its commitments much longer without a government decision to halt reductions. In the current political and financial climate, there is scant hope of that recurring.

If Canada is to adopt the strategy of placing greater weight on its contribution in the area of peacekeeping research, education and training, it must do so in the recognition that more countries than ever now want to, and should, participate in peacekeeping. The challenge is to ensure that they are as well qualified as possible. One way to do this is to establish an international education and training centre with the mandate to teach the teachers, train the trainers and educate the educators.

Such a centre would ensure that Canada continues to lead by example in the command, control and conduct of international stability operations. For the world an international training centre would mark a tangible effort to coordinate more effectively multi-faceted responses to increasingly complex conflicts and would provide a "place to go" outside of the overburdened UN, one dedicated to the sharing of peacekeeping information and expertise. It would address the problem of "equitable geographic representation" by developing a standard of competence whereby the skills of traditional contributors are translated to those contributors less-experienced but possessed of the willingness to learn. Recognizing the need for greater cultural sensitivity in peacekeeping operations, an education and training centre also would bring into close contact peacekeepers of differing backgrounds before they were called to work alongside each other in the field. Ultimately, such a centre would enhance international cooperation by itself becoming a forum for the exchange of ideas and techniques. But it would not be a place to teach basic military skills. These are better imparted in national locations, according to national philosophies and standards.

A STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

While the idea of an international peacekeeping training centre received renewed attention during the 1993 federal election campaign in Canada, for years politicians and private citizens have called for the creation of an institution which will conduct research, education and training activities associated with the planning, mounting and conduct of multi-disciplinary international stability operations. Only now has it become a reality.

The Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies of Toronto, Ontario and New Dawn Enterprises of Sydney, Nova Scotia, have firmly established The Canadian Peacekeeping Centre, a private, non-governmental, cooperative organization, that will offer a multi-faceted curriculum of interest to the many and diverse stakeholders associated with peacekeeping operations including armed forces, humanitarian aid and disaster relief agencies, police forces, elections officials and others. It will also function as an information clearing house. Its multi-disciplinary approach will reflect the changes in the international environment and will ensure that Canada remains an active participant in a new world order. The Canadian Peacekeeping Centre is a significant step in the right direction for Canada and for the global community.

The Canadian Peacekeeping Centre's first workshop will be held at the Coast Guard College near Sydney from April 18 - 22, 1994 and will serve to acquaint participants with all aspects of the planning, preparation and conduct of peacekeeping missions. Experts from all parts of the peacekeeping spectrum will serve as resource staff and will guide the practical, role-playing exercise which will conclude the week-long activity.

Courses, seminars and workshops will include such topics as: *An Introduction to Peacekeeping and International Stability Operations *The Canadian Approach to Peacekeeping *Organization of the United Nations and its Approach to Peacekeeping

*The Planning and Preparation of a Peacekeeping Operation *National and International Conduct of Peacekeeping Operations *An Integrated Approach to Disaster Relief *The Role of Law Enforcement Agencies and Personnel in International Stability Operations *Planning and Conducting Good Governance Operations

*Country and Region Cultural Awareness *Negotiation, Arbitration, Conciliation and Mediation Skills *Media Relations *Generic and Mission Specific Command and Staff Simulations. Provision also exists to add research and student evaluation components to any programme in order to facilitate the attainment of undergraduate or graduate university credit.

The Centre's methodology will have students read into a particular topic which will then be the subject of lectures and presentations. Multi-disciplinary, interactive group discussions will explore all ramifications of the topic. Case studies, exercises and role-playing simulations will be employed to confirm learning and draw out lessons.

THE CHANGING FACE OF PEACEKEEPING

It is clear that the changing face of peacekeeping reflects a changing international environment in which conflicts, particularly cultural conflicts, are increasingly complex and in which the use of non-traditional peacekeeping methods is required to bring about a cessation of violence and a process that will enable disputing parties to consider the underlying source of their hostility. The great divide that once existed between the military and humanitarian aid agencies has been bridged and the former are directly involved with ensuring that the latter are able to accomplish their tasks. While objectivity, consistency and impartiality remain standards for potential peacekeepers, the more immediate aim is to balance national interest with the need to guarantee an acceptable measure of international peace, security and stability. Though "conflict" in some form will remain a natural part of all relationships, it will be possible to dilute tension and to arrive at a "resolution". While critics may argue against continuing third-party intervention under the "peacekeeping umbrella", the fact remains that many people are alive today, or at least better off, because of the actions of UN peacekeepers.

Furthermore, peacekeeping remains a high-profile way for middle powers to play a role in international affairs disproportionate to what their resources otherwise would allow. Peacekeeping is also cost-effective for governments whose expenditure receives more attention per dollar than if the same amount were channelled through other less-visible departments.

Canada is a prime example of a middle power that has used peacekeeping as a way to build reputation on the international stage. Since Lester B. Pearson suggested a UN Emergency Force during the Suez Crisis of 1956, the name Canada and peacekeeping have been synonymous. Canada has participated in virtually every UN peacekeeping operation - a record unmatched by any other state. But Canada's involvement in peacekeeping has not been motivated solely by self-interest. Rather, continued peacekeeping activity is consistent with Canada's larger foreign policy goal of being an active and significant internationalist in a rapidly-changing global environment.

In the early days of peacekeeping it was accepted that the USA and the USSR did not contribute troops to missions. Rather, the USA contributed much in the fields of construction, logistics and transport support. The USSR helped not at all. Of late the USA developed a vigorous interest in participation, as indicated in the Haiti, Somalia and former Yugoslavia situations. However the unexpected and surprise criticism of America in other countries has resulted in a dismal and rapid cooling of USA ardour. This reversal has made the world's only remaining superpower the object of disappointment

and anger. The USA has been unwilling to put its soldiers in harm's way but has been insistent that the use of force of other types, such as that of bombing, could solve thorny problems -- such as those in the former Yugoslavia. Steven Peck, Research Analyst in the Political Military Studies Program of the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, in analyzing the soon-to-be-promulgated Presidential Decision Directive 13 (PDD-13), explains that the Clinton administration is taking a two-tiered approach to peacekeeping: (1) The USA *will support* new UN operations only if there is a real threat to international peace and security; a major humanitarian disaster requiring urgent action; a legitimate democratic government in danger; or, a gross violation of human rights. (2) But the USA *will commit its troops* to an operation only if: US national interests will be served; the US contribution is of sufficient size to ensure success; or sufficient domestic political support exists. Moreover, he says, the USA will divide bureaucratic responsibility for peacekeeping between the State Department and the Defense Department, and will consider carefully issues of finance, command and control, and the role of regional organizations.¹⁰ Clearly, the USA is a tentative, albeit willing, peacekeeping participant. Hence, it is all the more important that Canada continue to play a major role.

However, it is also clear that traditional contributors such as Canada cannot alone continue to absorb the costs of being party to every UN peacekeeping mission. Financial constraints and domestic pressure to cut defence budgets mean that if the UN is to live up to the ever-growing burden of expectation placed upon it, more states must become involved in all aspects of international stability operations. Also, given the resurgence of deep-seated and messy cultural clashes in the post-Cold War world, it is crucial that peacekeeping operations themselves exemplify cultural sensitivity and multilateralism.

To this end, the Canadian Peacekeeping Centre will both acknowledge and develop the New Peacekeeping Partnership that has emerged between the military, humanitarian aid agencies, good governance officials and civilian police. The new Centre will equip and prepare other states to absorb more of the costs of peacekeeping and to achieve a standard of competence that will enhance the command, control and conduct of all international stability operations. This is a positive development for Canada and for all countries which are striving to do more with less money. To quote the late Mr. Lester B. Pearson during his acceptance speech for the Nobel Peace Prize in 1957:

What is needed is a new and vigorous determination to use every technique of discussion and negotiation that may be available, for the solution of the tangled, frightening problems that divide today, in fear and hostility...and thereby endanger peace. We must keep on trying to solve problems one by one, stage by stage, if not on the basis of confidence and cooperation, at least on that of mutual toleration and self-interest.

[In reference to UNEF I] We made at least a beginning then. If, on that foundation, we do not build something more permanent and stronger, we will once again have ignored realism, rejected opportunities and betrayed trust.

The time has come for us to make a move, not only from strength, but

from wisdom and from confidence in ourselves; to concentrate on the possibilities of agreement, rather than on the disagreements and failures, the evils and the wrongs of the past. ...if there is to be peace, there must be compromise, tolerance and agreement.

These words are as true today as they were in 1957. The time is now to reorganize peacekeeping both to reflect and to affect a rapidly-changing international environment.

The New Peacekeeping Partnership was explored at "Peacekeeping '93: An Exhibition and Seminar" held in Ottawa on 16, 17 March 1993. For the complete proceedings see: Morrison, Alex, ed. The Changing Face of Peacekeeping: Canada (Toronto); The Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies; 1993. For a good source of general information, consult Peacekeeping and International Relations, a bi-monthly journal published by the Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies. Also see: Jones, Peter Peacekeeping: An Annotated Bibliography; Canada (Kingston); Ronald P. Frye & Company; 1989, available from the CISS.

John Mackinlay and Jarat Chopra Second Generation Multinational Operations, in The Washington Quarterly; Vol. 15 (Summer 1992); pp. 113-134.

Boutros-Ghali, Boutros An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peace-keeping; USA (New York); Department of Public Information, United Nations; 1992.

Portions of this paper have been published previously and also formed the basis of a discussion paper for a meeting held in Sydney, Cape Breton in September of 1993 which led to the establishment of The Canadian Peacekeeping Centre. See also: From the Editor: Beware of the Definitional Morass, in Peacekeeping and International Relations; Vol. 22, No. 6 (Nov/Dec 1993).

Huntington, Samuel P. The Clash of Civilizations, in Foreign Affairs; Vol. 72, No. 3 (Summer 1993); pp. 22-49.

Weiss, Thomas G. New Challenges for UN Military Operations: Implementing an Agenda for Peace, in The Washington Quarterly; Vol. 16, No. 1 (Winter 1993); p. 56.

Ibid.

Simon Serfaty of the Washington-based Center for Strategic and International Studies speaking with Paul Mooney of Canadian Press; Release AM-Canada-Bosnia; January 25, 1994.

Weiss, Thomas G. New Challenges for UN Military Operations: Implementing an Agenda for Peace, in The Washington Quarterly; Vol. 16, No. 1 (Winter 1993); pp. 51-66.

Peck, Steven US Peacekeeping Policy: An Update; Briefing paper prepared by the Center for Strategic and International Studies, Political-Military Studies Program; Washington, DC; Feb 10/ 1994.

STRATHROBYN PAPERS

Strathrobyn Papers are produced and distributed with the authority of the Commandant, Canadian Forces College, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

The views expressed herein are those of the author(s) of each paper, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Government of Canada nor of the Department of National Defence.

As Canadiana, *Strathrobyn Papers* are deposited with the National Library of Canada and are available from Communications Canada Group, Supply and Services Canada.

Institutional exchanges are welcome.

ISSN-1192-9081
SSC Catalogue Number D12-4/1E

Strathrobyn Papers are published occasionally.

Editorial Board:

Commandant, Canadian Forces College
(ex officio);
Miss C. Murphy, Chief Librarian, CFC;
Dr. B. Rollason, Academic Director, CFC.

Address:

Canadian Forces College,
215 Yonge Boulevard,
Toronto, Ontario
Canada, M5M 3H9

Fax: (416) 482-6908

STRATHROBYN PAPERS

Strathrobyn Papers sont produits et distribués sous l'autorité du commandant, Collège des Forces canadiennes, Toronto (Ontario), Canada.

Les points de vue exprimés sont le reflet de la pensée de l'auteur ou des auteurs de l'essai et ne reflètent pas nécessairement le point de vue du Gouvernement du Canada ou du ministère de la Défense nationale.

En tant que Canadiana, *Strathrobyn Papers* sont déposés à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada et on peut se les procurer du Groupe Communication Canada, Approvisionnements et Services Canada.

Les échanges avec d'autres établissements sont les bienvenus.

ISSN-1192-9081
ASC numero de cat. D12-4/1E

Strathrobyn Papers sont publiés tous les trois mois.

Comité de rédaction:

Commandant, Collège des Forces canadiennes (membre d'office);
Mme C. Murphy, bibliothécaire en chef du CFC;
D^r B. Rollason, directeur des études du CFC.

Adresse:

Collège des Forces canadiennes
215, boulevard Yonge
Toronto (Ontario)
Canada M5M 3H9

Télécopieur: (416) 482-6908

